



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/604,224	07/01/2003	Chi-Chan Chiang	CHEP0024USA	1223
27765 7590 09/25/2007 NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION P.O. BOX 506 MERRIFIELD, VA 22116				
			EXAMINER PHAM, THIERRY L	
			ART UNIT 2625	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 09/25/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

winstonhsu.uspto@gmail.com
Patent.admin.uspto.Rcv@naipo.com
mis.ap.uspto@naipo.com.tw

<p align="center">Office Action Summary</p>	<p>Application No.</p> <p>10/604,224</p>	<p>Applicant(s)</p> <p>CHIANG, CHI-CHAN</p>	
	<p>Examiner</p> <p>Thierry L. Pham</p>	<p>Art Unit</p> <p>2625</p>	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 8-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 8-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.</p> | <p>4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.</p> <p>5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application</p> <p>6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</p> |
|---|---|

DETAILED ACTION

- This action is responsive to the following communication: an Amendment filed on 7/12/07.
- Claims 1-3 & 8-16 are currently pending.
- Amendment filed with respect to the specification has been considered and entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The examiner carefully reviewed the original filed specification and unable to find the teaching of “a button on the first housing” as cited in claim 1, line 21. Rather, a button is located on a second housing 28 (fig. 6) and not on a first housing 24 (fig. 6).

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Limitations/features “after a button on the first housing receives a print command” as cited in claim 1, line 21 is unclear and confusing. A button receives a print command? According to the original filed specification, a button does not have any controller and/or circuit built-in, therefore, the examiner is unclear how a button is able to receive a print command (e.g. an electronic signal). Clarification is herein required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young No (US 6587140) in view of Ozawa et al (US 6115137).

Regarding claim 1, Young No discloses a printer (printer 5, fig. 1) comprising:

- a first housing (printer's housing, fig. 1);
- a printing module (print engine 44, fig. 1) installed on the first housing for printing data according to print signals; and
- a controller (PC card 7, fig. 1) comprising:
 - a second housing (PC card's housing, fig. 7) that can be detached (removable PC card, fig. 1) installed on the first housing;
 - a processor (PC card's processor 90, fig. 2) installed in the second housing for processing programs and data; and
 - a display panel (PC card's display unit, fig. 3) installed on the second housing and electrically connected to the processor for displaying data wherein includes a button (fig. 3) for designate printing.

Young No fails to teach and/or suggest wireless transmitting modules for the printer and controller.

Ozawa, in the same field of endeavor for printing, teaches a well-known example of a wireless transmitting modules for printer and controller (infrared communication interface for both printer and camera, figs. 1-3). Wireless communication is well known and widely implemented in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify printer of Young No to include a wireless transmitting module as taught by Ozawa because of a following reason: (●) implementing a wireless transmitting module is to

reduce hardware costs (e.g. cables) and to provide more efficient communication protocol (e.g. portability).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Young No with Ozawa to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Regarding claim 2, Young No further discloses the printer of claim 1 wherein the controller further comprises a plurality of buttons (plurality of buttons, fig. 3) installed on the second housing for inputting control signals.

Regarding claim 3, Young No further discloses the printer of claim 1 wherein the controller further comprises a touch panel (touch panel, fig. 3) installed on the display panel for inputting control signals.

Regarding claims 8-10, Ozawa further teaches the printer of claim 7 wherein the first transmitting module and the second transmitting module utilize the IEEE 802.1b WLAN protocol, Bluetooth, infrared (fig. 1-3, Bluetooth and WLAN communication protocols are well known and widely available in the art).

Regarding claim 11, Young No further discloses the printer of claim 1 wherein the controller further comprises a storage device (DRAM or FLASH RAM, fig. 2, col. 4, lines 39-62) that can be detached installed on the second housing for storing data. Notes: Reed also teaches an example of detached memory devices.

Regarding claim 12, Young No further discloses the printer of claim 11 wherein the storage device is a read-only memory (EPROM 96, fig. 2).

Regarding claim 13, Young No further discloses the printer of claim 11 wherein the storage device is a flash memory (col. 4, lines 58-62).

Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young No and Ozawa as described in claim 1, further in view of Reed (US 6426801).

Regarding claims 14-15, Young No fails to teach and/or suggest wherein first and second connecting port conform to the USB1.0 or USB2.0 standard.

Reed, in the same field of endeavor for printing, teaches a well-known example of first and second connecting port conform to the USB1.0 or USB2.0 standard (USB, col. 4, lines 20-21).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify printer of Young No to include a USB connecting port as taught by Reed because of a following reason: (●) processing images from plurality of sources (e.g. flash memory card, USB port interface, and etc).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Young No with Reed to obtain the invention as specified in claims 14-15.

Regarding 6, Reed further discloses the printer of claim 14 wherein the third connecting port conforms to IEEE1394 standard (col. 4, lines 30-32).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/12/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- Regarding claim 1, the applicants argued the secondary reference (US 6115137 to Ozawa et al) fails to teach and/or suggest that the camera is able to send print signal to the printer (see page 8, lines 5-6) and the applicants also argued the wireless module of Ozawa is only used to exchange

print data, it is not used to control the printing of the printer from a remote device. Therefore since neither Young No nor Ozawa teaches any remote device for controlling the printing of the printer wirelessly (see page 8, lines 13-17).

In response, the examiner herein fully disagrees with applicants' arguments/assertions. Ozawa clearly teaches a method wherein print data is transmitted from a digital camera to the printer wirelessly. This transmission is herein interpreted as "print signal". In addition, the applicants argued Ozawa fails to teach and/or suggest a remote device for controlling the printing of the printer wirelessly. However, such assertions and/or limitation are not cited in claim 1. In other words, the applicants argued subject matters that are not cited in the claim. There is no indication/feature in claim 1 that teaches a printer controller that controls the printer wirelessly. The main function of the printer controller (in the second housing) is to transmit the print data to the printer wirelessly and it does not control the printer's functionality wirelessly. Therefore, the arguments presented by the applicants are not persuasive.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- US 2002/0099884 to Chang et al teaches a well-known example of a detachable/removable printer controller that wirelessly controls and transmits signals to the printer (fig. 7).

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2625

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thierry L. Pham whose telephone number is (571) 272-7439. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30 AM - 6:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571)272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Thierry L. Pham


GABRIEL GARCIA
PRIMARY EXAMINER